

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/804,188	03/19/2004	Kil-soo Jung	1793.1227	6761	
49455 STEIN, MCE	7590 02/19/2009 WEN & BUI, LLP	EXAMINER			
1400 EYE STREET, NW			TEKLE, DANIEL T		
SUITE 300 WASHINGTO	ON. DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2621		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/19/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/804,188		JUNG ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	DANIEL TEKLE	2621		

	DANIEL TEKLE	2621						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 08 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
In Ref. FireDy was <u>January 2008</u> FAILS OF DECEMBER 11 APPLICATION IN COMPILION FIRED AND ADDITION FOR ADDITI								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07().							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort in (a) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the malling date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any sermed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp								
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter			appeal. Since a					
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	thin the time period set forth in 37	SFR 41.37(a).						
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor								
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below								
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	·····,							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [be entered and an e	xplanation of					
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov	ided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4.6-17.19.21-42.44 and 45.								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13. Other:								
/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/								
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621								

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner respectifully disagrees with applicant arguments.

Applicant argues on page 13 of the remark, "Haskell only discloses an MPEG-4 system that offers a variety of multimedia functions, but does not discloses a medium comprising core mode data, full mode data, and startup data.

In response the examiner respectfully disagrees. Haskell discloses core mode data means (MPEG-4 audio visual object, MPEG-4 boxesing and interaction, including navigation [paragraph 0062]); full mode data means (MPEG-4 based multimedia players and browser to facilitate these flexibilities, such as programmatic control via JavaScript and Java [paragraph 0009 and JavaScrip via HTML 0094]); and startup data which the claim language startup designates one of the mode data to be initially reproduced among the core mode data, browser mode data, and the program mode data means (the claim language required one out of three; however Haskell discloses core mode data a mention above, browser mode data and program control [paragraph 0009 and through out the reference]).

Applicant argument on page 14 of the remark regarding the storage medium, "Haskell does not suggest a storage medium that is loaded into a reproducing apparatus"; in response the examiner respectfully disagree since Haskell clearly show MPEC-4-coded data received from a storage device (paragraph 0031 and 0035). In addition the storage device of Haskell has a broad interpretation of a recording medium.

Applicant argument regarding a navigation data of claim 28; in response Haskell clearly teaches as disclosed in paragraph 0062.